



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

their grace and beauty no less trace of artistic effort than does 'Andromaque.' France, at least, no longer refuses to recognize in them its image, and thus exposes the arbitrary limits of NISARD to the danger of seeing succeeding epochs render justice to what had before been unknown or disdained.

Exception might likewise be taken to the statement that the predominant trait of the French mind is the practical. That common sense prevails in French literature is seen in the tendency towards satire. Yet it is a question whether this arises so much from a practical bent as from aversion to what lacks order, moderation; or, as NISARD says, from desire for discipline. There is, however, a logical sequence of thought, rigorous in its unfolding, running through French literature, whose result, practical or otherwise, depends entirely on the premises.

From another standpoint NISARD'S definition of art might perhaps be open to objection: as to whether literature must always present general truths. Human nature remains the same in its outlines, but each change of social surroundings brings into prominence different shades of thought and emotion. That all variations of humanity are essentially the same general truths may be philosophically axiomatic, but whether the presentation in literature of these variations is accepted as true in all time may be open to doubt. The novels of the seventeenth century may be conceded to represent certain phases of the human mind, but it is evident that NISARD does not consider them to be literature. DAUDET is beyond cavil an artist, but a change of social conditions will render his best works unreadable.

Thus the history of literature has for us a broader meaning than is afforded by the definition of NISARD. It is the history of the human mind expressed in language. The study of human thought in the various periods of its manifestation, which by no means implies the study of all linguistic productions but rather of those that are typical, leads to an intelligence of national traits that can be used as a basis of comparison for the striking characteristics of each period. The rule of NISARD embraces but a part of the truth; it was also not applied impartially or indepen-

dently. Yet with its shortcomings, its one-sidedness, we owe to it many admirable delineations of works and authors, among which are the best presentations of some of the greatest writers of France, a valuable defence of classical taste, and a constant incentive to express the true by the beautiful.

F. M. WARREN.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

---

### OLD ENGLISH LITERATURE.

*English Writers.* An attempt towards a History of English Literature. By HENRY MORLEY, LL.D., Professor of English Literature at University College, London. Vol. I, Introduction. Origins. Old Celtic Literature. Beowulf. Cassell & Co., 1887. Vol. II. From Caedmon to the Conquest. 1888.

This edition of PROFESSOR MORLEY'S 'English Writers' is a re-writing of his well-known work first published in 1864-67, two volumes in three, and extending to Dunbar, or to the invention of printing. The two smaller volumes now published form the first instalment of an intended 'History of English Literature' in twenty volumes, and two more volumes will complete the period covered by the original work. It was designed that the volumes should be issued half-yearly, but the Preface to the first volume is dated January, 1887, and the "Last Leaves" of the second volume, January 1888, so that at this rate it is to be feared that the work will never be completed by its author, a result much to be regretted on many accounts. With great modesty PROFESSOR MORLEY remarks in his Preface: "After waiting and working on through yet another twenty years, the laborer has learned that he knows less and less. Little is much to us when young; time passes and proportions change. But, however small the harvest, it must be garnered," and in his "Last Leaves:" "If the evening of life do not give long enough light for the completion of this book, it will be, at any rate, complete as far as it goes." That this light may be granted will be the earnest desire of every student of English literature.

The instalment now given to the public

forms a complete whole in itself, and constitutes a history of Anglo-Saxon, or, as PROFESSOR MORLEY prefers to call it, First English literature. Lack of access to a copy of the original work, now out of print, has prevented a comparison to ascertain the exact changes and additions that have been made. If memory serves, the Introduction, comprising a general review of the four periods of English literature,—namely, the Formation of the Language, Italian Influence, French Influence, and English Popular Influence, the last dating from Defoe, is reprinted as it originally stood. The principal changes seem to be in taking advantage of the works that have been published in Germany, and especially of the articles that have appeared in the *Anglia*, discussing Anglo-Saxon literature, although PROFESSOR MORLEY is very conservative and by no means agrees with the iconoclastic views of some German scholars. The first impression made upon the reader is the extent of the work beyond its immediate subject. There is a large amount of valuable information contained in it, especially historical information, but the question naturally arises, what direct connection has this with the history of Anglo-Saxon literature? Some of the chapters can be regarded only as digressions, and, while important in themselves, as comparatively irrelevant to the main subject. A history of Celtic literature, and of the literature of other branches of the Teutonic peoples, has but a remote bearing upon the First English literature, and if discussed at all, might have been treated in much less space. This would have left room for a fuller treatment of some works that have been passed over rather briefly.

The first four chapters of the first volume treat the Forming of the People,—and here such questions as “Were the Gaels Hyperboreans?” and “Were the Celts Cimmerians?” are discussed,—the Old Literature of the Gael and of the Cymry, and the Old Literature of the Teutons, including ‘Ulfilas,’ the ‘Song of Hildebrand,’ and the ‘Weissenbrunner Prayer.’ The result is that the only works in Anglo-Saxon literature treated in this volume are the ‘Beowulf’ and the ‘Fight at Finnesburg.’ In the scheme of the Indo-

European family (I. 130) the terminology used may be objected to in respect to the Teutonic branch, in that “Gothic” is applied to the whole branch, Moeso-Gothic and the Scandinavian languages are included under “Low-German,” and “Teutonic” is applied only to what are usually known as the Low-German languages, namely, Old Saxon, Frisian, and Platt-Deutsch, the relation between the first and last of these not being otherwise indicated. This is at least different from the ordinary arrangement and liable to confuse the learner. In the chapters on the literature of the Gael and Cymry, there is much translation from the works discussed, so that the reader is put in possession of much useful information, even if it has a very remote bearing upon English literature. On pages 257-8 and 261 there is a singular *lapsus* of memory, which causes Ulfilas to be referred to as if he were contemporary with Odoacer and Clovis, although his correct period has just been given. This has, however, been observed and corrected in the “Last Leaves” of Vol. II.

The ‘Beowulf,’ as its importance deserves, is treated at considerable length. By means of translation and paraphrase a full account of the poem is given, after which follows a fairly complete summary of critical opinion. PROFESSOR MORLEY follows GREIN in his interpretation, but gives too much space to MR. HAIGH’s theory of identification of names of tribes and places mentioned in ‘Beowulf’ with those of England, which theory, as far as I know, has not been adopted by any other scholar. He summarizes also PROFESSOR EARLE’s recent attempt to vindicate an English origin for the poem. GREIN’s interpretation of the Thrytho episode is given on pp. 336-7, and seems to be favored, but the old error of regarding Hygd as the wife of Offa is mentioned along with GREIN’s view on p. 300 without condemnation. It appears too in the summary of MR. HAIGH’s view (p. 323), and on p. 322 we have from MR. HAIGH, “Hygd being either another name of Hygelac, or the name of his queen.” PROFESSOR MORLEY accepts GRUNDTVIG’s identification of Hygelac with the historical Chocilaicus (circa 520) mentioned by Gregory of Tours, but does not note the bearing of II. 2921-22,

“*ús waes á syððan*  
*Merewioinga milts ungyfeðe,*”

upon the date of the poem, although he translates (p. 335), “Ever since then we have been denied the friendship of the Merovingians.”

Though of minor importance, as a matter of interpretation it may be noted that PROFESSOR MORLEY says (p. 298); “then Grendel’s head was borne by the hair into the place where men were drinking, and the head of the woman also;” and again (p. 339): “when Beowulf had returned victorious and presented to Hrothgar the heads of Grendel and Grendel’s mother.” The poem does not state that he brought back any head but that of Grendel, and I presume this opinion of PROFESSOR MORLEY rests upon a misinterpretation of *ides* in 1650 which refers to Wealhtheow and not to Grendel’s mother; for we are told that he took nothing from the cavern

“*búton þone hafelan and þá hilt somod*” (1615);

again in 1636 we have *hafelan*, singular, as explained by *Grendles hêafod* in 1640 and 1649; *ides* is used of Grendel’s mother in 1260 and 1352, but not in 1650, for the men bore into the hall only the head of Grendel. This might not deserve mention but that PROFESSOR MORLEY’S view is adopted in the argument to PROFESSORS HARRISON and SHARP’S edition of ‘Beowulf.’ MÜLLENHOFF’S theory of the composition of ‘Beowulf’ is briefly summarized at the close of the chapter, and the opinion expressed that “Courage is all that is wanted to make any one great as an analyst in the new speculative chemistry applied to books.”

The last chapter of Vol. I contains a translation of the ‘Fight at Finnesburg’ and of the corresponding episode in ‘Beowulf,’ and is followed by a useful bibliography of ‘Beowulf.’

Vol. II treats the other existing remains of Anglo-Saxon literature, beginning with ‘Widsith,’ which is translated. The following chapter on ‘The Scóp’ contains translations of ‘The Seafarer’ and ‘The Fortunes of Men,’ and discusses MÖLLER’S view of the original strophic form of ‘Widsith,’ which PROFES-

SOR MORLEY pronounces “critical sleight-of-hand,” and concludes: “Enough has been said to show how largely this method of destructive criticism rests upon conjecture; and how little the common repetition of such phrases as ‘clearly,’ or ‘it is certain,’ can give certainty to the most ingenious system of three-piled hypotheses. And when all’s done, where is our poem?” It must be acknowledged that the German “tear-to-pieces” criticism has been “run in the ground,” and not sufficient weight has been given to the objections that may reasonably be urged against this method of analysis.

Next comes another interesting digressive chapter on the “First Teachers of Christianity,” preliminary to an account of the poems ascribed to Caedmon. BAEDA’S familiar account is repeated, and the ‘Genesis’ is treated quite fully, with considerable translation, but the ‘Exodus and Daniel,’ and the second book, ‘Christ and Satan,’ are very briefly summarized. A translation of the ‘Muspilli’ and an account of the ‘Heliand’ follow, with a summary of SIEVERS’ pamphlet on ‘The Relation of the Heliand to Caedmon’s Paraphrase,’ but PROFESSOR MORLEY thinks that “Caedmon’s poem . . must have been known to the Old Saxons long before the ‘Heliand’ was written” (p. 108). PROFESSOR MORLEY endorses the very probable view that MILTON knew of Caedmon’s Paraphrase from JUNIUS, its first editor (1655). This chapter closes with a brief summary of opinion on the authorship of Caedmon’s poems, and another fling at the analytic criticism applied by way of burlesque to the Introduction to the first volume of this work.

Two chapters follow, chiefly on Bede and Alcuin; and while containing much of general historical interest, there is little of special connection with literature in the Anglo-Saxon tongue. This is resumed in brief notices of the Northumbrian fragments, and other works contained in SWEET’S ‘Oldest English Texts,’ but PROFESSOR MORLEY does not seem to have known of SWEET’S ‘Anglo-Saxon Reader, Part II,’ although it was received in this country before the date of the ‘Last Leaves,’ for in his note to p. 178 on the contents of the ‘Oldest English Texts’ he ascribes to Mr.

SWEET the opinion that the Vespasian Psalter is Kentish, as ZEUNER held, but in his later work MR. SWEET decides that it is Mercian. This error is repeated on p. 322, in opposition to STEVENSON's old view that it was Northumbrian. This chapter contains a full translation in blank verse of the 'Judith,' that spirited fragment of Anglo-Saxon poetry, the superior excellence of which makes us regret the more that so little of it has been preserved. A description of the contents of the Vercelli and the Exeter Books follows, and of the 'Menology' and the 'Salomon and Saturn,' but all very brief; and then we have a chapter on Cynewulf, a discussion of his name in the Runes, and of his connection with the Riddles, the authorship of which PROFESSOR MORLEY is inclined to deny to him. I cannot enter into the discussion, but PROFESSOR MORLEY sums up his opinion as follows: "We have, then, no evidence upon which to ground a belief that Cynewulf wrote any of the First English riddles." SARRAZIN's odd view that Cynewulf wrote the 'Beowulf' is then summarized from *Anglia*, Vol. IX, and "the myth of Cynewulf" is reconstructed after WÜLKER in *Anglia*, Vol. I; the conclusion is reached that he lived in the eighth century; "His work shows that he was a 'scôp.' There is no evidence that he was a priest or monk. Here ends our knowledge of the personality of Cynewulf, and even that includes a trace of supposition."

'The Vision of the Cross' is next translated, but the opinion of DIETRICH and TEN BRINK as to its Cynewulfian authorship is dissented from. The inscription on the Ruthwell Cross is described, and the views of CHARITIUS and LEFÈVRE (*Anglia*, Vols. II and VI) as to the 'Guthlac' are briefly given, with short notices of the 'Physiologus,' the 'Wanderer,' and the 'Ruins,' or 'Ruins,' as PROFESSOR MORLEY prefers to call it.

Here follows another digressive chapter on Dicuil and Erigena, chiefly the latter, after which we have a very full account of king Alfred and his literary labors, but the types make the author ascribe to King Alfred the compilation of the 'Chronicle' in the year 991. PROFESSOR EARLE's valuable edition of that work is curiously omitted on p. 294, although

PROFESSOR EARLE's name appears in another note on the 'Chronicle' on p. 308.

Monasticism in the tenth century is treated in connection with Dunstan and Ethelwold, and this is followed by an account of Aelfric's works, a blank verse translation of the 'Battle of Brunanburh,' with brief notice of the other pieces of verse in the 'Chronicle,' a prose summary of the 'Battle of Maldon,' a brief notice of the Psalter and the Charters, and a further account of MR. COCKAYNE's 'Leechdoms, Wortcunning, and Star-craft of Early England.' The consideration of the period is closed with an account of Wulfstan's works, bare mention of the 'Apollonius of Tyre' and a few other prose pieces, a description of the 'Rhyming Poem,' and a summary of the contents of 'The Grave,' included, perhaps, because printed in Thorpe's 'Analecta Anglo-saxonica,' but I can see no reason for counting this poem as a specimen of Anglo-Saxon literature, for its language shows that it was manifestly written after the close of the period.

This chapter closes with a too brief reference to the 'Anglo-Saxon Gospels,' which is not brought down to date, for PROFESSOR SKEAT's noteworthy edition is omitted entirely, THORPE's being the last one mentioned.

The volume closes with a chapter on the Northmen, in which an account is given of the 'Eddas,' with a full translation of the 'Völuspá,' of the Northmen in France and England, and of the times of Edward the Confessor to the Norman Conquest. This chapter illustrates further what has been said of the tendency of PROFESSOR MORLEY to digress from his main subject. His account of Icelandic literature is interesting and useful, but of very remote connection with English literature, and the subsequent historical narrative is readily accessible anywhere, so that some of the space occupied with these subjects might have been devoted to a fuller and more thorough account of some of the Anglo-Saxon poems that have been too briefly passed over. PROFESSOR MORLEY is acquainted with TEN BRINK's work on 'Early English Literature,' as TEN BRINK's views are occasionally referred to, but it is nowhere mentioned, nor is PROFESSOR EARLE's shorter work on 'Anglo-Saxon Literature,' although this book will not super-

sede them. A useful Bibliography is appended, but it is not full enough for the scholar. The last work mentioned in it is WÜLKER'S 'Grundriss,' which might have been used to advantage in the body of the volumes. PROFESSOR MORLEY expresses the hope that when WÜLKER prepares a new edition, he will arrange for its translation into English. I may be permitted to state that two American scholars, MESSRS. MCCLUMPHA and DEERING, WÜLKER'S pupils, are now making arrangements for the publication of an English translation of this valuable work, indispensable to every Anglo-Saxon scholar, with the full authority of PROFESSOR WÜLKER and the use of the important material that he has collected for a second edition.

Anglo-Saxon scholars will be thankful to PROFESSOR MORLEY for this new edition of the first volume of his 'English Writers,' which deserved re-writing, but while, from PROFESSOR MORLEY'S point of view, he may defend the inclusion of so much extrinsic matter, I think that the work would have been improved by both omission and insertion, so that it might serve as the standard history of Anglo-Saxon literature, an office that, in its present form, it will scarcely fulfill. "The half is sometimes more than the whole."

JAMES M. GARNETT.

*University of Virginia.*

#### THE STUDY OF ROMANCE PHILOLOGY.

*Die Romanische Philologie.* Ein Grundriss von FR. NEUMANN. Leipzig, Fues's Verlag, 1886; pp. 96.

*Encyclopaedie und Methodologie der romanischen Philologie*, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Französischen und Italienischen von GUSTAV KÖRTING. Heilbronn, Henninger, 1884-'86; 3 vols., pp. XVI+224, XII+505, XX+837.

*Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*, unter mitwirkung von neunundzwanzig Fachgenossen, herausgegeben von GUSTAV GRÖBER. Strassburg, Trübner, 1886-'88; I. Band, pp. 835.

Three publications of a similar character—all intended to introduce the scholar to a thorough

study of Romance Philology, yet each treating the subject in so distinctive a way that there will be but little competition among them.

We shall not make an effort here to give a full account of the immense amount of scholarship set down on nearly 2500 pages by men who all rank among our first masters; but we shall try so to characterize the above works, and to give such information on their contents, that each of our readers may be able to judge which of them will best serve his own purpose, and where, in a given case, he is likely to find just the reference wanted. Only occasionally, when the subject under consideration and the character of our own studies will allow, shall we venture to add some suggestion of our own.

NEUMANN'S 'Die romanische Philologie, ein Grundriss' is a reprint from SCHMID'S 'Pädagogische Encyclopaedie,' vii. The author addresses himself not so much to experts in our science as to beginners, and to a larger public of non-specialists in general. The subject was therefore to be treated with the most elementary clearness and at the same time with the greatest brevity compatible with scientific, I mean thorough, work. We must say that NEUMANN has succeeded admirably well in this difficult task, and his book can be highly recommended to students who desire to receive an insight into the character, aims, history, present state and means of development of Romance Philology; it will also prove useful to scholars in other departments, especially in Latin and Teutonic Philology, whenever they wish to cast the necessary side-glance on their neighboring field.

The book is divided into two parts: in the first chapter the author gives an outline of the history of our discipline, culminating, as was natural, in a sketch of the life and works of our venerated "Altmeister" DIEZ; the second part contains a—well, we hesitatingly say bibliography, although it is not a bibliography in the common acceptance of the word, not a mere compilation and juxtaposition of dead titles, appalling to beginners and next to useless, because of the fact that worthless publications are mentioned in the same breath with important ones, so that the inexperienced student never knows which to choose first and rarely strikes the right one. NEUMANN'S bib-